



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/427,675	10/27/1999	ERIC JACQUINOT	JACQUINOT=7	3607
1444	7590	12/22/2003	EXAMINER	
BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C. 624 NINTH STREET, NW SUITE 300 WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303			DEO, DUY VU NGUYEN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1765	

DATE MAILED: 12/22/2003

30

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/427,675	JACQUINOT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	DuyVu n Deo	1765

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 October 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 17-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 17-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 17-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacquinot et al. (US 6,043,159) and Grover et al. (US 5,759,917).

Jacquinot teaches a polishing an integrated circuit in which isolation layer, including silicon oxide and silicon nitride, is polished by an abrasive composition which comprises an aqueous acid suspension of individualized colloidal silica particles not linked to each other by siloxane bonds. The pH of the composition is about 1.5-4, the abrasives have diameters about 10-50 nm and a concentration of about 15-30% (col. 2, line 39-65; col. 4, line 1-10). Unlike claimed invention he doesn't describe that the support is impregnated with an abrasive liquid composition. However, since the polishing pad is soaked with the abrasive liquid composition during the polishing, the abrasive liquid composition would get into the abrasive pad and therefore, this would create claimed polishing pad that impregnated with an abrasive composition.

Unlike claimed invention, Jacquinot doesn't describe having a surfactant in the abrasive composition. Grover teaches a method of polishing the oxide layer using a surfactant in the abrasive composition. The surfactant can be anionic or nonionic (col. 6, line 38-48). It would have been obvious for one skill in the art at the time of the invention in light of Grover to add a surfactant because Grover teaches that a surfactant is used to improve the within-wafer-non-uniformity (WIWNU) of the wafers, thereby improving the surface of the wafer and reducing wafer defects (col. 6, line 45-48). The combined method would read on claimed the abrasive liquid composition consists essentially of an aqueous acid suspension of individualized colloidal silica particles not linked to each other by siloxane bonds and a surfactant or the abrasive liquid composition is substantially free of other components.

Referring to claims 31-36, Grover teaches that the surfactant concentration should be at 0.001-10%, and he teaches that it will typically vary depending on the particular surfactant selected and the nature of the surface of the metal oxide abrasive and the amount of additive is adjusted to achieve the desired concentration in the polishing slurry (col. 6, line 49-64).

Referring to claim 40, Grover further describes the layer used in isolation of integrated circuit, taught by Jacquinot, comprises oxide and nitride layer (col. 2, line 20-31).

Declaration

3. The Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed 8/1/03 is insufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 17-40 based upon prior art rejection as set forth in the last Office action because: it refer(s) only to the system described in the above referenced application and not to the individual

Art Unit: 1765

claims of the application. Thus, there is no showing that the objective evidence of nonobviousness is commensurate in scope with the claims. See MPEP § 716. While the declaration shows a better polishing selectivity between the TEOS and the nitride and a more stable slurry; however, the claims do not have or include the selectivity nor the slurry stability.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DuyVu n Deo whose telephone number is 703-305-0515.

DVD
December 18, 2003

